TO:

CLERK

Mary L. Moran

## Mail Stop 8 Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## REPORT ON THE FILING OR DETERMINATION OF AN ACTION REGARDING A PATENT OR TRADEMARK

DATE

2/24/2010

In Compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 290 and/or 15 U.S.C. § 1116 you are hereby advised that a court action has been ☐ Patents or filed in the U.S. District Court on the following Oregon DOCKET NO. U.S. DISTRICT COURT DATE FILED 09-3027-PA 3/16/2009 District of Oregon PLAINTIFF DEFENDANT David Austin Roses, Ltd. Jackson & Perkins Wholesale, Inc. PATENT OR DATE OF PATENT HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK TRADEMARK NO. OR TRADEMARK -See Attached -2 3 5 In the above—entitled case, the following patent(s)/ trademark(s) have been included: DATE INCLUDED **INCLUDED BY** ☐ Amendment ☐ Answer Cross Bill ☐ Other Pleading PATENT OR DATE OF PATENT HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK TRADEMARK NO. OR TRADEMARK 3 4 In the above—entitled case, the following decision has been rendered or judgement issued: DECISION/JUDGEMENT Judgment and Permanent Injunction for Plaintiff, David Austin Roses, Ltd.

Copy 1—Upon initiation of action, mail this copy to Director Copy 3—Upon termination of action, mail this copy to Director Copy 2—Upon filing document adding patent(s), mail this copy to Director Copy 4—Case file copy

(BY) DEPUTY CLERK

- 35. Defendant Jackson's continued growth and sales of patented roses, without paying the royalties required under the Agreement, are unauthorized, and constitute patent infringement.
- 36. Upon information and belief, Defendant Jackson has infringed, and will continue to infringe until enjoined by this Court, at least the following patents:

U.S. Plant Pat. No. 7220

U.S. Plant Pat. No. 8688

U.S. Plant Pat. No. 8765

U.S. Plant Pat. No. 9527

U.S. Plant Pat. No. 11421

U.S. Plant Pat. No. 13315

U.S. Plant Pat. No. 13484

U.S. Plant Pat. No. 14943

U.S. Plant Pat. No. 16300

U.S. Plant Pat. No. 18713

True and accurate copies of the above-referenced patents are attached hereto as Exhibits 2-12.

Defendant Jackson has direct knowledge of these patents, and its failure to pay royalties, and subsequent patent infringement, constitutes willful infringement.

37. This is an "exceptional case" within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 285.